



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,749	07/17/2003	W. John Gardenier	1442.033B	1803
7590	02/03/2006		EXAMINER	
John Pietrangelo Heslin Rothenberg Farley & Mesiti P.C. 5 Columbia Circle Albany, NY 12203				PHILLIPS, CHARLES E
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3751		

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/621,749	Applicant(s) GARDENIER ET AL.
	Examiner Charles E. Phillips	Art Unit 3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 65-80 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 73 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 65-80 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 65,67-68,70-71 and 74-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludlow in view of Kvalvik.

Ludlow teaches a tub in Fig. 5, where the headrest 175 is positioned below the upper rim of the spa. Kvalvik teaches a tub T, having a headrest 30 with a speaker and speaker grille 38 therein. In light of this use of a speaker in a headrest, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan to employ a speaker in the Ludlow headrest. This renders full response to claims 67-68,70 and 75-80.

Re: claim 71, as these are well known resilient materials, the use of same would have constituted an obvious expedient of choice in design. Likewise, as the use of marine-grade speakers is known in the art, the use of same to perfect this combination would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan as well.

Claims 66, 69 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 65 above, and further in view of Diamond.

Diamond teaches the sound source placement of claim 66 in that the speaker 40 is seen to be fed by wires distal of the speaker. Also taught here are a plurality of speakers 40 in Fig. 1a.

Claim 73 stands withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6/28/04. This claim is objected as well since applicant has stated that it reads on the elected embodiment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Charles E. Phillips at telephone number 571-272-4893.



Charles E. Phillips
Primary Examiner